

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application N .	Applicant(s)
	09/901,419	HALE ET AL.
	Examin er	Art Unit
	Peter Paras, Jr.	1632

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Peter Paras, Jr. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Kathryn Doty. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 09 October 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner informed Applicant that the previous Office action mailed on 10/3/02 is vacated in view of the attached Office action. The instant Office action now includes rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 and does not reiterate the rejection of claims 1-5, 11-12, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Hillman et al. Hillman et al has been recited in a new rejection under 35 U.S.C. because Hillman et al did not actually teach production of a recombinant TMP-2 fusion protein in insect larvae .